



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

25c. a Year

Devoted to The
High-School-College
Entrance
Scholarship Fund

THE NEW YORK

LATIN LAFLET

Entered at the Post Office in Brooklyn as second-class matter, October 29, 1900

25 Issues

Every Penny of
Every Subscription
goes into the
Scholarship Fund

VOL. II

BROOKLYN, NEW YORK, OCTOBER 14, 1901

No. 27

The internal purpose of this publication is to provide a Clearing House for secondary classical teachers in New York and vicinity or anywhere else; to afford an opportunity to younger classical scholars anywhere for the publication of their more modest endeavors along the line of original work, which might not otherwise see the light; to stimulate the teaching and quicken the student activity in the classical work in the high schools of Greater New York. The external purpose is to establish one or more College-entrance-scholarships for the most successful graduates from high schools in New York City, to be awarded on a competitive examination. The proceeds over and above expenses will be devoted to a scholarship fund. The labor involved is a labor of love.

TRUSTEES OF THE SCHOLARSHIP FUND

ARTHUR S. SOMERS, Central Board of Education

WILLIAM E. WATERS, College Entrance Examination Board

Notes on Horace, Satire 1. 5

v. 34. *Fundos Aufidio Lusco praetore libenter linquimus*

It is very evident that Aufidius Luscus did not possess the title *praetor* in the ordinary official use of the word, for although originally Fundi together with Formiae had belonged to Campania and according to the statement of Festus was a *praefectura*, in B C 186 it ceased to be such and instead of praetors three aediles were appointed, who were the only magistrates. (See *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, J. Marquardt, I 151. 2nd Ed. Leip. 1881). But according to Forcellini there were officials called praetors who had to do with religious affairs. He says: "*frequentius tamen in municipiis et colonis praetores sacris quibusdam praetuisse norimus.*" In my opinion Aufidius Luscus held such a position and in that sense Horace uses the word.

v. 36. *prunaeque vatillum*

As between the readings *vatillum* and *batillum* I accept the former. All the MSS read it except r and s corr. which give *batillum*. Cruquius says that practically all the codices have *vatillum* except two minor ones, which must be lost, as no other mention of them is found. In Pliny *Hist. Nat.* 23 8 we read *vatillis terreis*, so according to Keller (*Epilegomena zu Horaz* p. 467) both the archetype of Horace and that of Pliny read *vat* instead of *bat*. Hence I argue that *batillum* is only a later deterioration from the other and more classical form. Cruquius (commentary) derives it from *vas*, being a denominative form, Keller

from the Sicilian word *βατάνη, βατάνιον*, meaning a "dish" or "bowl", which was pronounced like *vatane, vatanion*; and which has no relation to *vas*. Hence I adopt *vatillum*.

The explanations of the use of the word are varied. Acro and Porph. say that Aufidius ordered coals to be borne before him from the public baths by servants. Cruquius says that incense was offered in the *vatillum* upon the safe arrival of guests and that it was of brass. It was however shown to the guests as if it were gold and Cruquius thus explains the use of *insanus*. He also states that it was used in winter, being filled with coals and placed above the table so that the banquetters might be warm. But as it was autumn, no such use would be made of it here. Moreover Horace does not mention eating at this place. Others suggest that it was used as a *turibulum*. Others say it was used for heating firebrands in the punishment of criminals brought before a magistrate, or for burning incense at the inauguration of his court. Some suggest that it is a contemptuous name for something carried before the official, perhaps a flimsy imitation of the *scipio eburneus* of the consul. It was early proposed to read *bacillum*, "a little staff", which Cruquius supports by Cic. *de leg. agr.* 2 34 93, where lictors preceded the praetors with two torches. Schütz adds that possibly one lictor preceded Aufidius, but that instead of torches, he had to resort to a pan of coals. This would require *pruni* for *prunae*.

If the interpretation I have put upon *praetore* be right, then I argue that the *vatillum* was just as much the symbol of the priest-hood as the *praetexta* was of the senatorial order, and that he had it borne before him as such.

v. 45. *proxima Campano ponti*

In commenting on this phrase Cruquius makes a glaring mistake, and a statement entirely unsupportable. He says *arbitror hic significari Fregellas qui pons Corvus nunc dicitur*. He quotes as support Livy 26 9. Of course it is quite probable that there was a bridge at Fregellae over the Liris, but it is out of the question to think that it could be the place referred to, for Fregellae is north-west of Sinuessa, quite a distance from the Via

Appia. The travellers would hardly have redoubled their steps and gone so much out of their way, as they would have to do, had they gone to Fregellae. The *pons Campanus* was beyond doubt over the Savo, which is between Sinuessa and Capua, and over which the Via Appia passes. Its location is fixed by Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 14 6 62: *Falernus ager a ponte Campano laeva petentibus Urbanam coloniam Sullanam nuper Capuae contributam incipit*. This is in exact accordance with the facts.

v. 51. *quae super est Caudi cauponas*

It is true that all of the MSS of Class 3, according to K & H and the majority of 1 and 2 read *Claudii*, but *Caudi* is undoubtedly the proper reading as Acro and Porph. give it and never mention *Claudii*. Moreover the form *Caudi* would to the thoughtless copyist, who was familiar with *Claudii* and *Claudii*, seem more difficult and he would likely change it to *Claudii*.

cum

v. 60. *sic mutilus minitaris?*

Some MSS read *miniteris*, but Acro and Cruquius have *minitaris*. I prefer the indicative since with *cum* it expresses the actual fact, as here. Compare Cic. *Verr.* 1 10 28.

v. 60 sq. *at illi foeda cicatrix saetosam laevi frontem turpaverat oris.*

Horkell has proposed *levi—orbe*, but it would hardly be probable that a *foeda cicatrix* would be in the form of a circle. Kiessling suggests *levis—oris*, but the expression *saetosam frontem* implies a rough surface rather than a smooth one. Apitzius has *ora*, that is *in margine*, but is hardly worth considering. Peerlkamp says that the *cicatrix* was in the middle of his forehead among the hairs and it was round and free from hairs. Therefore he conjectures *saetosam clypei frontem turpaverat orbe*, implying that it was in the form of a shield. He adds that Cicirrus resembled a Cyclops, because of this round scar on his forehead, which would appear similar to an eye. My opinion is that the *cicatrix* did not necessarily have to be in the middle of his forehead, but that it might be anywhere on his face and yet be sufficient to remind Sarmentus of the Unicorn and the Cyclops. Peerlkamp's conjecture is too radical to be considered. While the reading *laevi frontem oris* is somewhat odd, yet it is so well attested by the MSS and is used by Acro and Porph. and especially Cruquius, that I am convinced that it is the proper reading.

N WILBUR HELM

Princeton University

Another Stricture on "Sea Surface"

Owing to the limited space at the disposal of THE LEAFLET, we can not hope to be able to answer all the communications that reach us, but in fulfilment of a promise made last year we afford "Sea Surface" space in which to answer briefly several questions, inspired by his fourth communication in No. 19 of THE LEAFLET, which have been sent to us by N Poseidon, Att'y for Zeimlich Hochheimer & Co. "Sea Surface" says:

"Reference to No. 19 will obviate the necessity of restating the points made in my fourth communication, on which the questions are based, and thus space may be economized: I will take up the questions of N Poseidon in their order: 1 'What is the proof that *mortuo* is a participle and not an adjective?' It was not even implied that *mortuo* could not be an adjective, but in view of the fact that the exercise in which this word occurred followed almost immediately the lessons on Deponent Verbs and the Ablative Absolute, it seemed to me better pedagogics to have it explained as a participle. 2 'Is *pugnatum est ut oppidum occuparent* a purpose, and is it impersonal?' In the first place, we fear that the example here cited (no reference is given) is home-made Latin put together for purposes of refutation rather than because it possesses the weight of classical authority; but in any event, the construction is logically personal even if impersonal in form, and it is needless to say that in the realm of Purpose it would be impossible to escape the personality of the will. 3 'Is *Cæsar tam audax erat ut regnum optaret* a result, and is it personal?' I should say here again (although no reference is given) that the result is based on the involuntary character of '*audax*' rather than on the voluntary and personal character of the will, and that the logical standing of Result as impersonal is not affected even by the fact that *erat* has a formal personal subject. 4 'What is the objection to explaining *fearing-clauses* as original *wishes* transformed into opposite values by prefixed fears?' There is no objection whatsoever to explaining *fearing-clauses* in this way, nor is there any objection on the other hand to the use of any pedagogical and illustrative device which will help tender minds to an appreciation of the subject. Such a device was suggested in the communication referred to. 5 'Does not your explanation suggest a false construction for verbs of *doubt* in Latin?' If the objection contained in this question were valid, we should be shorn of a very valuable source of illustration and comparison. Pupils are very prone to follow English analogies in dealing with Latin, but Latin peculiarities can be impressed upon pupils' minds as effectually by pointing out the same sort of peculiarities in their mother tongue as by pointing out differences. The construction of verbs of fearing in Latin is very surprising to the beginner, but he is reconciled to this situation when he finds the identical construction in his own language, though under somewhat different circumstances. 6 'Do not verbs of *doubt* affect all minds alike?' However similarly verbs of doubt may affect all minds logically, the ways in which these affections are recorded in different languages are certainly vastly different, and this is the point in question. 7 'Is "the king doubted that the soldiers would come" English?' The elegance of the English in this merely illustrative sentence is not material, so long as a pedagogical purpose is served. It may happen that the very best way of getting the logic of an Ablative Absolute construction, for instance, impressed